DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 943 JC 970 603

AUTHOR	Coulter, Sara; Hedges, Elaine; Goldenberg, Myrna
TITLE	Integrating the Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum of Selected Community Colleges in the Baltimore-Washington Area. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Towson State Univ., MD.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1990-07-30
NOTE	31p.
CONTRACT	P116B81435-88
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Course Descriptions; Cultural Awareness; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Change; Females; Information Dissemination; *Instructional Innovation; *Integrated Curriculum; Models; Teacher Workshops; Two Year Colleges; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Towson State University MD

ABSTRACT

Beginning in 1988, faculty at Towson State University (Maryland) conducted a two-year project intended to integrate the new scholarship on women into selected courses in five community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area. The project was designed to foster curriculum integration work in community colleges, and created a model described in the project's publication, Community College Guide to Curriculum Change. The heart of the project was five workshops, where faculty analyzed the new scholarship on women and explored its applicability to their courses. Each participant researched and revised a particular course, then tested and evaluated the revised course in the classroom during the project's final semester. Faculty also participated in a two day summer institute that focused on pedagogy, and a state-wide conference at which they disseminated the project's results. The project's organization and structure were intended to provide a model for other group projects by community colleges. A three-tiered structure was created that provided several levels of leadership opportunities and a system of broadly shared responsibility. The project resulted in 44 significantly revised courses that encourage awareness of gender, race, and class issues. The aforementioned publication is being distributed both locally and nationally in efforts to extend and institutionalize the work of the project. (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 943

Integrating the Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum of Selected Community Colleges in the Baltimore-Washington Area

Final Report:
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education Grant

Sara Coulter
Elaine Hedges
Myrna Goldenberg

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- [x] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- [ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 990 603

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Integrating the Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum of Selected Community Colleges in the Baltimore-Washington Area

Grantee Organization:	Towson State University Women's Studies Program Towson, MD 21204-7097
Grant Number:	P116B81435-88
Project Dates:	Starting Date: August 1, 1988 Ending Date: July 31, 1990
Project Directors:	Dr. Sara Coulter English and Women's Studies Towson State University Towson, MD 21204-7097 (301) 830-2660
	Dr. Elaine Hedges English and Women's Studies Towson State University Towson, MD 21204-7097 (301) 830-2660
	Dr. Myrna Goldenberg English and Women's Studies Montgomery College Rockville, MD 20850 (301) 251-7417
FIPSE Program Officer:	Dr. Helene Scher

Grant Award:	Year 1	$98,560
	Year 2	137,403
	Total	235,963

Integrating the Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum of Selected Community Colleges in the Baltimore-Washington Area

SUMMARY

This was a two-year project to integrate the new scholarship on women into selected courses in five community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area, using the resources developed in the Towson State University FIPSE integration project. Forty-five faculty from five schools met in discipline-oriented workshops--Allied Health/Biology, Fine Arts, History and Philosophy, Literature and Composition, and Social Science. Over three semesters faculty read and analyzed the scholarship on women, including minority women, in their disciplines, revised one or more courses, and tested and evaluated the new courses in the classroom. The workshops were supplemented with a Summer Institute on Pedagogy. The project concluded with a presentation at a statewide meeting of community college faculty in Maryland and the publication of a book describing the project's procedures and results.

Project Directors:

Dr. Sara Coulter
Towson State University (301) 830-2660

Dr. Elaine Hedges
Towson State University (301) 830-2660

Dr. Myrna Goldenberg
Montgomery College (301) 251-1417

Project Book: *Community College Guide to Curriculum Change*
Elaine Hedges, Myrna Goldenberg, and Sara Coulter, eds.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Title: Integrating the Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum of Selected Community Colleges in the Baltimore-Washington Area

Grantee Organization: Towson State University
Women's Studies Program
Towson, MD 21204-7097

Project Directors: Dr. Sara Coulter, (301) 830 2660
Dr. Elaine Hedges, (301) 830 2660
Dr. Myrna Goldenberg, (301) 251 7417

This was a two-year project to integrate the new scholarship on women into selected courses in five community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area. Forty-five faculty met in workshops organized according to curriculum areas--Biology and Allied Health, Fine Arts, History and Philosophy, Literature and Composition, and Social Sciences. They read and analyzed the new scholarship on women in their disciplines, revised one or more courses, and taught, tested, and evaluated the revised courses in the classroom. In addition they attended a summer institute focused on pedagogy, gave presentations at a state-wide meeting of community colleges at the end of the project, and published the results of their work in the project's book, Community College Guide to Curriculum Change.

Although there have been by now hundreds of faculty development projects designed to introduce the new scholarship on women into the curriculum, very little activity has occurred or been encouraged at the community college level. Yet the two-year colleges enroll 43 percent of all undergraduate students in higher education. This project was therefore designed to foster curriculum integration work in community colleges by creating a model for such work. The model, described in the project's publication, Community College Guide to Curriculum Change, addresses not only the realities of the community college teaching and learning situation, but also how to achieve effective cooperation among community colleges and how to utilize regional resources in higher education to fulfill needs and achieve change.

In 1987, at the conclusion of a three year FIPSE-funded curriculum integration project, Towson State University held an Area Conference to disseminate the project's results to secondary and post-secondary faculty and administrators, including many from community colleges. The following year, under a FIPSE dissemination grant, it worked with ten community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area to introduce them to the concept of curriculum integration and to solicit interest in participating in a community college-focused curriculum integration project. Five colleges were chosen for the two-

year project, based on their representative nature and willingness to commit resources to the project, including, especially, released time for faculty participants. The five colleges include both urban and rural campuses, one predominantly black institution, and others with significant numbers of minority students. The institutions also represented varying degrees of previous involvement in Women's Studies and curriculum integration activity, from extensive to minimal.

The heart of the project was the five workshops. In these workshops, which met five times each semester for three semesters, faculty read and analyzed the theory and content of the new scholarship on women in their disciplines and explored its applicability to their courses. During one summer each participant researched one unit of a particular course s/he had chosen to revise, continued that research and revision during the following semester, and then tested and evaluated the revised course in the classroom during the project's final semester. Workshop activity was supplemented, in the first semester, by a series of four formal presentations to the entire project by guest speakers who addressed broad issues of curriculum change relevant to all of the academic disciplines, and, in subsequent semesters, by consultants chosen by the individual workshops to address specific workshop interests and needs. Faculty also participated in a two day summer institute that focused on pedagogy and new theories about how students learn, and in a state-wide conference for community college faculty at the end of the project at which they disseminated the project's results.

The project's organization and structure were intended to provide a model for other group projects by community colleges. We created a three-tiered structure that provided several levels of leadership and that facilitated communication and cohesiveness among the five different colleges. The three project directors, two from Towson and one from Montgomery College (one of the community colleges), represented the cooperation of four- and two-year institutions. In addition there were ten coordinators, one for each workshop and one for each participating college. Workshop coordinators, in consultation with the project directors, planned the workshop activity, chose readings, and conducted workshop sessions. Campus coordinators met with project faculty from their campuses (who were otherwise assigned to the five workshops) and were responsible for organizing project-related activities at their schools and informing the schools of the project's work. This structure provided leadership opportunities for project members--especially important since such projects need to encourage participants to assume leadership roles in order to continue the work beyond the project's conclusion. In addition, it created a system of broadly-shared responsibility--important since college faculty are likely to be sensitive to any perceived "authoritarian" or unilateral decision-making by one or a few project directors who are their professional peers. Finally, the structure enabled project participants to meet and work with colleagues from other institutions in the workshops while at the same time belonging to a campus group through which they functioned as a community of scholars within their larger campus community. The group of ten coordinators met monthly with the project directors, usually shortly after each meeting of the workshops, to make plans and evaluate progress. This structure of workshop and

campus coordinators was most successful and seems logistically and psychologically suited for a multi-institutional project.

The immediate result of the project was the set of forty-four revised courses produced by the participants and covering major areas of the humanities, social sciences, fine arts, natural sciences, and nursing. Revisions extended from incorporating new material on women into a syllabus together with new bibliography and research and writing assignments for students to redefining course objectives and reconceptualizing an entire course. Comparison of pre- and post-project syllabi shows that significant revision was made in every targeted course and that in some the changes were sufficiently extensive as to amount to a total transformation of a course. As project faculty continue to teach their revised courses, they anticipate making further changes and also extending the work of revision to other courses they teach. Faculty also made significant and often extensive changes in their pedagogy, with the goal of encouraging more active and critical student participation and of encouraging greater awareness of gender, race and class issues.

A major result of the project has been the formal recognition by the institutions involved of the importance of reexamining and changing their curricula to reflect more accurately the realities of gender, race, and class as these affect the ways in which knowledge is produced, organized, and conveyed. Campus activities to extend and institutionalize the work of the project have already begun and will continue. These include the establishment of broad-based campus groups to initiate and conduct study groups and seminars, lecture series, staff development and mentoring programs, and student discussion groups.

The book produced by the project, Community College Guide to Curriculum Change, is a major accomplishment of the project. It describes the project's organization and procedures and contains descriptions of workshop activity, sample revised syllabi, and a set of eleven essays by project faculty describing the process of their personal and professional change. This book is being distributed both locally and nationally and will be a major instrument to continue disseminating the work of the project. In addition, in recognition of the success of this and Towson's previous curriculum integration project, Towson State University has established a new Institute for Teaching and Research on Women, under which curriculum integration work will continue.

The purpose and structure of the project have proved to be practical and effective. Multi-campus discipline-based workshops, decision-sharing with coordinators, prominent participation of community college faculty and administrators, flexibility and responsiveness, ongoing evaluation, and strong and experienced leadership all contributed to the success of the project.

Integrating the Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum of Selected Community Colleges in the Baltimore-Washington Area

Final Report

Project Overview

This was a two-year project to integrate the new scholarship on women into selected courses in five community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area. Forty-five faculty from five community colleges met for three semesters in workshops divided according to curriculum areas--Biology and Allied Health, Fine Arts, History and Philosophy, Literature and Composition, and Social Sciences. During the course of the project they read and analyzed the scholarship on women, including minority women, in their disciplines, explored pedagogy at a summer institute, revised one or more courses, and tested and evaluated the revised courses in the classroom. At the conclusion of the project they participated in and gave presentations at a state-wide meeting of community colleges and incorporated the results of their work in the book that the project published, which is being nationally distributed, the Community College Guide to Curriculum Change. The five colleges in the project have a total student body of over 75,000 students, of whom approximately 55 percent are female, including significant numbers of African-Americans and Asian-Americans. The revised courses taught by faculty in the project's final semester enrolled approximately 900 students. All faculty, however, reported that they could not and did not restrict course revision to the designated courses; in other words, the faculty revised all the courses they taught to reflect their new knowledge and insights.

Purpose of the Project

Faculty development projects designed to introduce the new scholarship on women into academic disciplines and courses and thus ultimately to transform the curriculum have been conducted by now on hundreds of campuses throughout the country. Most of these, however, have been four year liberal arts colleges and universities. Very little activity has occurred or been encouraged at the level of the two-year or community college, even though such institutions educate over one-third of all the students in higher education. In 1983 community college students represented 4.7 million of the total 11.1 million undergraduates enrolled in institutions of higher education, and projections for 1990 indicate a decrease in four year college enrollment but an increase to 4.8 million in community colleges. Currently, women represent 55 percent of community college students and an even higher percentage of those completing degrees. Community colleges enroll over half the nation's first year college students, including large numbers of women and minorities. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, 43 percent of all black, 55 percent of all Hispanic, and 57 percent of all Native American undergraduates are enrolled in community colleges. Projections that suggested that more than half the 1990 entering class would enroll in community colleges should engender a respect for the diverse student body as well as a commitment to empower these students with courses that authenticate their reality.

This project was designed to help foster curriculum integration work at the community college level by creating a model for such work. The model addresses not only the realities of the community college teaching and learning situation, but how to

achieve effective cooperation among community colleges and between two and four year institutions, and how to utilize regional resources in higher education to fulfill needs and achieve change.

Background and Origins

In 1987 the Towson State University Women's Studies program had successfully completed a three year FIPSE-funded curriculum integration project at Towson, which concluded with an Area Conference at which it disseminated the project's results to secondary and post-secondary faculty and administrators, including many from community colleges. The following year, under a FIPSE dissemination grant, it worked with ten community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area to introduce them to the concept of curriculum integration and some of its applications. During that year, expressions of interest and commitment were solicited from the administrators--deans and presidents--of the community colleges, and five colleges were chosen to participate in the planned two-year project. Choices were based both on the representative nature and the degree of commitment of the institutions. We wanted, and achieved, diversity--urban and rural campuses, including one predominantly black school, and schools both with and without a previous history of Women's Studies or curriculum integration work. Above all, it was necessary to choose schools whose administrations would give the faculty in the project the released time necessary for them to do the project work, since we had discovered in our previous project that without some relief from a full teaching load (and the load is highest in the community colleges) faculty were sometimes forced to slight the work of the project. We might note that securing and then maintaining this released time was

not easy: administrators do not wish to remove from the classroom those who are often their best and most motivated teachers; it is expensive to do so, and faculty not in the project often misunderstand or make invidious comparisons. At one institution released time had to be renegotiated during the course of the project. At the one predominantly black institution in the project, because of the unusually low level of public funding, released time for four of the five participants had to be subsidized by the grant.

Our first curriculum project taught us that we needed to build into this one sufficient planning time, particularly because working with five institutions made planning more complex. Thus, the nature of the project--namely, its multi-college and multi-campus dimensions as well as the fifteen hour teaching load each semester--necessitated assigning released time both to participants so that they could work on their course revisions and to coordinators so that they could facilitate the work of the participants.

Project Description

With five diverse colleges in the project, and faculty from all five spread among the five workshops, we created a tiered structure that simultaneously provided several levels of leadership and also facilitated communication and cohesiveness. In addition to the three project directors (who represented the four year and one of the participating two year institutions) and five workshop coordinators, there were five campus coordinators, who were responsible for informing their schools of project activity and for facilitating communication among project participants from their campus (see Appendix B 1.2). Participants in the project thus became members of a workshop where they enjoyed the stimulation of meeting with colleagues from other colleges, and at the same

time they participated in a campus group, thus functioning as a community of scholars within their larger campus community. The workshop and campus coordinators met monthly with the project directors, usually shortly after each meeting of the workshops, to report on workshop sessions and campus activities, make plans, and evaluate progress. We want to emphasize how successful this structure of workshop and campus coordinators was. It is logistically and psychologically suited for a multi-institutional project. Having several levels of leadership meant greater shared responsibility and an enhanced democratic structure. This latter is especially important since college faculty are rightly sensitive to any perceived "authoritarian" or unilateral decision-making by faculty from four-year institutions and by project directors who are their professional peers, and because curriculum integration projects want to encourage participants to assume leadership in order to continue and extend the work beyond the project's termination.

The first semester of the project was devoted to careful planning, essential for the success of any project and particularly one as complex as this one. The forty-five participants, who included 38 women, 7 men, and 3 members of racial or ethnic minorities, were chosen after writing formal applications in which they described their reasons for wishing to join and the course they planned to revise. This was a more elaborate procedure than we had used in the Towson project, and it was designed both to create commitment and to get faculty to focus immediately on syllabi issues. The project directors chose the workshop and campus coordinators from among the participants, and much of the first semester was devoted to preparing the coordinators

for their future work.

Preliminary meetings, phone conversations, and distribution of materials culminated in a two-day planning retreat. The agenda for the retreat included a presentation on the history of curriculum integration work and the experiences of other projects, given by an outside consultant, Betty Schmitz of the University of Maryland, who has had wide experience in curriculum integration work. Other sessions included one explaining curriculum integration "stage theory," another that provided and discussed sample revised syllabi and books and other basic resources, and others devoted to defining the goals of this project and determining logistics and workshop procedures (see Appendix C.2). This planning retreat was invaluable, both in providing the coordinators with essential information and in enabling them to become acquainted both with each other and with the project directors and in thus beginning to develop identity as a team.

During this planning semester, project members were given some introductory reading, to familiarize them with the theory behind curriculum integration and to provide them with a shared basis of information and vocabulary for use in their workshops when these began in the project's second semester. Although the major reading chosen--Margaret Andersen's comprehensive sociological study, Thinking about Women -- was not uniformly successful and elicited varying degrees of interest, with some faculty objecting to its sociological "jargon" and others finding its coverage too broad and insufficiently detailed, we still believe that some common reading that introduces faculty to issues of how women, and knowledge about women, have been traditionally dealt with in the academic disciplines is an essential context for curriculum change work. Another

assigned reading by Andersen, "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education" (Signs, 1987), which describes the theory, practice and results of curriculum integration, was more successful.

The project's second semester saw the beginning of organized workshop activity (see Appendix A), with faculty meeting five times in workshop sessions lasting from two to three hours (and the coordinators meeting five additional times). Parts of four of the five workshop meetings were devoted to formal presentations to the entire group by a series of speakers, including two of the project directors and three outside consultants, who discussed 1) the historical development of the academic disciplines and the implications for them of incorporating the scholarship on women, 2) paradigm shifts in the disciplines, 3) minority women and the curriculum, and 4) stage theory. Again the purpose was to provide faculty with a broad, common body of history, theory, and operative assumptions as a context for their more individualized workshop activity. The project directors structured the semester so that it would begin with broad overviews of the disciplines, move to specific changes that resulted from new knowledge and technology, and then close with a model that faculty could apply to their individual courses. The intention was to provide the participants with a view of the goals of the project as both manageable and attainable. On the whole, the plan was successful, but the group presentations did cut into workshop time, and some faculty felt they were not moving quickly enough into examining their own specific discipline or curriculum areas. More important, however, this plan did not allow the participants to get to know one another, or to "bond," early in the project, especially important when faculty from

different colleges are grouped into discipline-based workshops. We would therefore recommend fewer such lectures at the opening of a project, postponing some until later, or perhaps alternating between workshop and consultant/speaker sessions. We would also recommend at least one session (or part of a session) in which all the participants had an opportunity to learn about one another's goals and work in the project. Meanwhile, in cooperation with the workshop coordinators, we initiated the more specific examination of disciplinary and course issues by assigning discipline-focused readings for discussion and analysis in the individual workshop meetings. In the final session of the semester, each participant submitted her/his plans for changing a particular course.

During summer 1989, each project participant chose a unit of a course for planned revision and researched the new scholarship on women available for that unit, in preparation for teaching the revised unit in the classroom the following semester. The directors and coordinators had agreed that a limited approach to course revision could serve as an effective introduction to full course revision, and this approach did work for large numbers of project faculty, many of whom were in fact so stimulated by their research that they changed the entire course by the end of the semester. For other participants, however, this unit revision became the major or almost the sole revision done during the project; they delved very deeply into the issues in their chosen unit but formally changed little else in the course. If the unit approach is used, it is probably advisable to require from faculty a written outline of proposed future revisions for the entire course and a timetable for achieving that total revision.

The two day Summer Institute in August had two major foci (see Appendix C.3):

meetings of the workshops in which faculty shared their experiences of transforming a course unit, and full group meetings of all project faculty devoted to feminist pedagogy. In preparation for the latter, faculty did readings in pedagogy and in recent research on women and minority students as learners, including Belenkey et al's Women's Ways of Knowing, the Fall/Winter 1987 issue of Women's Studies Quarterly, and the AAC/Project on the Status and Education of Women's "The Chilly Climate: A Chilly One for Women?" They organized and presented a panel on their responses to the readings and their own experiences as learners--a session that elicited good audience discussion. Two invited outside consultants on feminist pedagogy led a session on feminist pedagogy, in which they described successful teaching strategies they had observed in upper level classrooms throughout the country. Project faculty commented informally and in their journals that the Summer Institute, though valuable, was too long and that a one day institute with more time devoted to workshop sessions would have been more beneficial. The project directors learned not to schedule overnight sessions close to home; participants who were tempted to drive home during meals and other breaks to check on their families were tired and somewhat distracted by family obligations during the Institute. We would consider recommending a long one-day Institute or a two or three day retreat setting, similar to the planning retreat for the coordinators held in the first semester.

The fall 1989 workshop meetings were devoted to discussion of readings in the new scholarship on women, but with the readings tailored more now to individual participants' interests and needs and to the actual work of syllabus revision that had

begun during the summer. Whereas in the previous semester (spring 1989), the coordinators gave the participants an abundance--perhaps a super abundance--of readings in order to introduce them to the issues of curriculum revision (see Appendix D), in this second semester of workshop activity the workshop coordinators for the most part chose the readings, focusing them on participants' specific interests. During this semester faculty also reviewed textbooks, chose new ones, and selected additional readings. In addition they examined issues of course organization--for example, whether to organize a course chronologically or thematically--and dealt with the inevitable and difficult question of what to omit when new material is introduced into a fixed course time frame. During this and the following semester, workshops also chose their own consultants to meet with them to discuss specific issues of concern to the entire group. These consultants were faculty, primarily from the Towson project and from other institutions in the mid-Atlantic area, who were already experienced in curriculum integration work.

The major work of the project's final semester for faculty participants was teaching their revised course in the classroom, testing and evaluating it, and reporting the results in workshop sessions. In addition, some workshop sessions were devoted to planning and composing the essays on the workshops that would be part of the project's publication, Curriculum Guide for Community Colleges. All project faculty wrote summaries of their course revision work for these essays including bibliography, and eleven faculty, or roughly 25 percent, also produced personal essays for the publication describing the process of personal and professional change they had experienced. We want especially

to point to these essays as indicating the degree of success of the project, since it is highly unusual for any curriculum integration project to elicit that degree of response to the request for sustained pieces of writing describing the process of change. Finally, during this final semester selected faculty from each workshop prepared presentations for the state-wide meeting of community colleges (AFACCT), which all attended in May (see Appendix C.4). We also want to note, however, that the two group activities--planning the workshop essays for the Guide and planning the AFACCT presentations--had mixed results. The preparation for the Guide brought each workshop to valuable consensus on the major transformation issues of their disciplines, and its publication pleased the faculty. However, many felt that too much time had to be spent drafting and rewriting copy. Creating the AFACCT presentations was eminently valuable for the experience it provided faculty of working together to present the project; AFACCT thus became a valuable rehearsal for future dissemination of the project. The actual AFACCT conference audience, however, largely because of the conference's remote location in Western Maryland, was disappointingly small, and some faculty therefore questioned the amount of time that had been invested in preparing for it.

Project Results

Faculty. The immediate outcome of the project was the revision by each faculty participant of at least one course central to the community college curriculum. Beginning with the unit of a course that each participant had researched and revised during the summer of 1990, course revision continued during the fall 1989 and spring 1990 semesters. The amount and degree of course change that was achieved varied according

to the participants, and especially according to how familiar they were with feminist scholarship and theory before entering the project. Change ranged from modest to extensive and radical: from adding units on women and new bibliography and student research topics to totally reconceiving and restructuring a course--and, in one case, reconceiving the better part of an entire program (in criminal justice). Comparison of syllabi before and after the project shows that some significant revision of content, organization and/or perspectives was made in every targeted course. Therefore, the minimum goal of the project was achieved.

However, the overall amount and quality of change that occurred went far beyond minimum expectations, as documented in the group and individual essays in the Guide to Curriculum Change, and in faculty post-project evaluations. Some courses, from fields as diverse as literature and sociology, have been entirely redesigned to focus throughout on issues of gender, race, and class, using these as central themes or organizing principles and not merely as one set of topics among others. These are courses that we would define as genuinely "transformed" rather than merely modified, and they thus represent the ideal or maximum goal of curriculum integration projects, but one that is usually not achieved within the specific time limits of any given project. All that a project can reasonably expect is to initiate change and provide a basis for ongoing change. Therefore we were surprised--and pleased--by the speed and depth of change in many cases. Meanwhile, it is worth noting that in their final evaluation of the project 73% of the participants rated the extent of their course revision in the highest two of five categories, with another 24% rating it in the middle of the range. And the figures were

almost identical for their "anticipated near future course revision." (See Appendix F.3.2, questions 9 and 10.) It is also worth noting (question 9) that 87% of the project faculty placed themselves in the two highest categories in assessing "change in personal awareness."

We are confident, from our knowledge of both the specific future plans of many participants and of the nature of the revisionary process, that other courses, which were partially revised during the project, will undergo further transformation. Faculty have described their new awarenesses and new perspectives and their plans for continuing the work of course change as well as for extending it to other courses they teach. Furthermore, the revisionary process, once set in motion, develops its own momentum. Once having participated in a curriculum integration project it is difficult if not impossible to return to a pre-project state of mind. This is not, however, to overlook the fact that several faculty made only minimal modifications to their courses. Generally, these were faculty who were relatively resistant and less open-minded at the start of the project and faculty who were clearly "loners" and who did not respond to working in groups. Having faculty make written application to join the project, as we did, including describing their goals, seems to us important in trying to insure that the most motivated faculty will be chosen, but the procedure did not eliminate those who eventually profited the least from the project. Perhaps more direct intervention by workshop coordinators to deal with those whose progress seemed inadequate would be advisable.

Institutions. A major result of the project has been the formal, public recognition by the colleges involved of the importance of reexamining and changing their curricula so

that they reflect the realities of gender, and of race and class issues, as these affect how knowledge is produced, organized, and conveyed in the classroom. The need to reexamine and change the curriculum has become not just a priority for some individual faculty but a priority for the institutions themselves, although we recognize that continued work by project participants will be needed for the institutions to remain truly committed to that priority. Project faculty understand this. They recognize both the need and their responsibilities for publicizing, extending, and disseminating their work, although they also anticipate that many of their colleagues may not be receptive (See Appendix F.3.2., question 19). Primarily as a result of our decision to train the participants for dissemination work, many have already begun to do so and others have begun to make plans to do so.

Students. By the end of the project approximately 900 students had the immediate experience of taking a revised course, and these numbers have increased as project faculty continue to teach these courses and extend their revisions to their other courses. Faculty report that the results of a pre- and post-course exercise administered in some of the revised courses to determine any increase in student sensitivity to and understanding of gender, race, and class indicate that some significant change in perception and awareness did occur. No test or exercise, of course, can evaluate how much change in students' knowledge and awareness occurred, especially since the impact a course may have on a student is likely to continue well after the course's conclusion. Furthermore, awareness is a two-way street; that is, it was enlightening to faculty and influenced their teaching to discover that many of their students did not know what gender, class, and

race meant.

Because of the project faculty's special interest in pedagogy and the learning process, they experimented with a variety of techniques in their courses to encourage more active student participation and to evaluate the effects of what was being taught. According to journals of the project faculty and written and oral workshop reports from coordinators, students responded positively to the new course content: students became more involved with the materials, wrote more papers, asked more critical questions, tested course materials against and related them to their own lives, and demonstrated greater interest in and understanding of the experiences of others. Ironically, in some classes, students felt "safer" in expressing their biases.

In turn, because the project emphasized the importance of race, class, and ethnicity as well as gender, faculty, in the revisions they made in courses and procedures and in their evaluations of these, showed significant evidence of becoming more aware and appreciative of the racial and ethnic as well as gender composition of the student body they teach. For example, the teacher of a composition/library research course realized during the project that the research topic she had used for years was seriously inappropriate for the African-American, Asian-American, and new immigrant students she taught. She has reorganized the course around a new research topic focused on issues of social, political, and economic justice in the United States that can be approached through the history and life experiences of minority as well as white students. Criminal justice faculty commented on their students' candidness; for example, in the "forced choice" exercise in which students must choose between changing their race or

their gender, students responded with an unanticipated racial bias and homophobia. These faculty understood the results as a clear mandate to modify reading, writing, and field assignments.

From examining the revised syllabi of project participants, the project directors conclude that sensitivity to the actual gender, racial, and ethnic diversity of the community college student body has been significantly enhanced, and that it is being reflected in changes in both course content and pedagogy.

Evaluation

We built more evaluation procedures into this project than into the previous one at Towson State University, especially procedures that enabled us to assess the project while it was in process, and we believe that these procedures were important in the project's success. Throughout the project there were regular evaluations both of and by the participating faculty, the workshop and campus coordinators, the project directors, and the students taking the revised courses. At the conclusion of the project an outside evaluator conducted an extensive formal evaluation of the entire project. (See Appendix F.)

For all four semesters of the project, faculty kept journals in which they regularly recorded their reactions to their readings, to the workshop meetings, to presentations by lecturers and consultants, and to teaching their revised courses. (See Appendix F.1.). These journals were collected once or twice each semester and read by the three three project directors and the workshop coordinators. The journal contents were used to assess the progress of faculty participants, to revise workshop procedures or content

where this seemed indicated, and to provide individual advice and assistance. For the project directors and coordinators, the journals were extremely valuable as a source of determining the attitudes and activities (or lack of activity) of the faculty. The journals enabled the workshop coordinators to address many issues before they became problems. Faculty themselves, however, were divided on the value of keeping a journal. As their final evaluations of the project indicate (See Appendix F 3.2., question 16), 50% rated the journal highly but 30% rated it low. Many found keeping a journal onerous, although by the end of the project many who had at first questioned it agreed that the journal had been of great value in focusing thought, venting frustration, expressing satisfaction, and measuring progress. Obviously, the results show that we haven't yet found the ideal way of encouraging faculty to record and assess their growth and change, although the journal achieved this far more successfully than the end-of-each-semester essays that faculty were asked to write in our first FIPSE project. What may be needed is a choice--journals for those who enjoy them, briefer, more structured and focused questions to answer in essay form for those who don't.

The monthly meetings of the project directors with the workshop and campus coordinators were used to measure the progress of the workshops and of related campus activity and thus provided a regular, ongoing vehicle for evaluation. These meetings provided an excellent opportunity for comparative evaluation of the five workshops as well. Both workshop and campus coordinators regularly presented written reports to the project directors, through which progress could also be assessed. In addition, during the summer of 1989 the project directors conducted individual interviews with all ten

coordinators during which their work and responsibilities were evaluated.

There were formal written evaluations by participants, in the form of questionnaires, at the conclusion of the Planning Retreat, the Summer Institute on Pedagogy, the AFACCT conference, and at the conclusion of the entire project. The evaluation questionnaires administered at the end of the project (see Appendix F.3.1.) indicate that faculty devoted much time and effort to the work; that although they had already made significant changes in their course(s), they anticipated even greater change in the future; that they had changed their pedagogy as well as their course content; and that they benefitted from the materials and consultants provided by the project. These results were tabulated and analyzed by Dr. John Webster (see Appendix F 3.2.) and Dr. Beth Vanfossen (See Appendix F 3.3.).

Course evaluation was systematically done by the project directors and the workshop coordinators. In the first semester of the project, and again at the project's conclusion, faculty completed a questionnaire on how they plan their courses, "Reflections on Course Planning," produced by the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIPTAL), and the computerized results were compared to assess change (see Appendix F 2.1.). These results, tabulated and analyzed by Dr. John Webster and Dr. Beth Vanfossen, indicate that some of the more important changes were an increased orientation toward content that explores contemporary social issues, toward helping students clarify their own beliefs and values, toward examination of diverse points of view, and towards faculty developing a greater sense of autonomy in planning course content. In addition, pre-project course syllabi,

objectives, bibliography, and writing assignments were compared with revised ones, to measure the amount and quality of change (see Appendix E and Appendix F.4., pp. 16-17). Most of the eleven personal essays included in the project book, Community College Guide to Curriculum Change describe in detail the revisions by those faculty in their courses, and include their evaluation of the extent and significance of the revisions they made (see Appendix H).

While teaching their revised courses, individual faculty used a variety of measures to elicit informal student evaluation of the courses. These included extensive use of student journals and use of the "minute paper," designed to provide quick feedback on how well students are learning and whether certain pedagogical techniques are succeeding. Because of their interest in pedagogy, and the expectation on community college campuses that course objectives will be fully and explicitly defined in all syllabi, project faculty were especially committed to creating and using evaluation techniques in order to assess the nature and amount of change in their courses and how the change was affecting students. Finally, faculty were asked to administer a simple pre- and post-course exercise in which they asked students in their revised courses to define gender, race, and class. The pre-course responses often indicated that students did not understand these terms. For instance, one student defined class as "what some people don't have." Based on this information, faculty were able to adjust their initial approaches to meet student needs. Post-course definitions were evaluated for greater complexity of understanding, not for a single correct definition. This evaluation instrument was used as a simple and partial measure of the nature and extent of change

in student knowledge and awareness from the beginning to the end of the revised course.

Dr. Wendy Kolmar of Drew University, our outside evaluator, conducted an extensive evaluation of the entire project between April and July 1990. This included reading the project proposal and related materials; visiting the project office at Towson and interviewing the secretarial staff; interviewing the project directors, the workshop and campus coordinators, and selected faculty participants; visiting at least one meeting of each of the five workshops; and writing a final report (see Appendix F.4.). Dr. Kolmar evaluated as exemplary the design, planning, implementation, and results of the project.

We believe that much of the success of the project is due to the kind and amount of evaluation we introduced into it, particularly the faculty journals and the system of regular meetings among project directors and workshop and campus coordinators--a system that was intended to provide an ongoing instrument of assessment. Through the journals and the meetings we were able to measure our progress, what worked and what didn't, at frequent intervals, and to make any changes or adjustments that seemed advisable.

Plans for Continuation and Dissemination

The campus coordinators of all five participating colleges have devised plans for continuing the project's work at their schools. Many of these are described in the "Campus Reports" in our publication, Community College Guide to Curriculum Change. They include presentations by project faculty to their departmental colleagues and other faculty groups; the establishment of broad-based campus groups to continue curriculum

integration activities, including the creation of study groups and seminars, lecture series, staff development programs, mentoring sessions, and student discussion groups. At Montgomery College, a newly-created Women's Studies program, established partly as a result of the success of the FIPSE project, will be another instrument through which curriculum change will be fostered. The Literature and Composition workshop members of the project, representing all five participating campuses, have plans to continue to meet regularly. Anne Arundel Community College is revitalizing their women's program and is planning a faculty seminar in curriculum integration; they have made a major commitment to curriculum transformation and are planning summer workshops and other faculty development projects. Prince George's Community College is actively exploring the implementation of similar projects on that campus; their newly-introduced newsletter on women's studies issues includes a calendar of lectures and discussions. The Community College of Baltimore held a very successful full day conference on minority women, and, although the school is in the process of re-organization and re-financing, it is also continuing the curriculum transformation work.

Descriptions of the project and copies of its publication, the Community College Guide, have been sent to the presidents, deans, and libraries of all the community colleges in Maryland, and we are encouraging these schools to contact project faculty who can give lectures or workshops. A more systematic state-wide dissemination, originally planned by the project directors for a dissemination grant, may still be conducted in the future.

Copies of the Community College Guide are also being sent to centers of

curriculum integration work throughout the country and to selected community colleges in the United States. The Guide was written not only as a report on our project but in order to present our project as a model that other community colleges can use in undertaking curriculum integration projects. It will therefore be a major dissemination instrument, and we anticipate continuing and extending the work of the project through it. This continuation will be especially facilitated because we have developed a core group of project faculty who have already begun to take an active role in curriculum integration work beyond the immediate region of their campuses. Over one dozen have already given presentations on the project at national conferences, including the meetings of the National Women's Studies Association, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the Modern Language Association, the College Art Association, and Community College Humanities Association, and they and others are planning presentations at future conferences.

Further facilitating this continuation work is the establishment at Towson State University of a new Institute for Teaching and Research on Women. The Center, with a full-time director, has been funded by the university in recognition of our success in conducting two FIPSE-sponsored curriculum projects, and curriculum integration will be one of its major emphases. Thus we shall have an umbrella organization under which we can continue to foster and support the continuation of the community college project as well as other curriculum integration work. The Towson State Women's Studies publication, On Our Minds, with a national circulation of 2000, and which has reported on the community college project while it was in progress, will also regularly report on

the continuation work of the project. The project was also featured in issues of Innovations Abstracts, Community College Week, Women's Studies Quarterly, Houghton-Mifflin's English Basics, and the new National Education Association publication, currently in preparation, Solutions that Work (see Appendix G).

Summary and Conclusions

Many of our conclusions have been incorporated into our description of the project. For the sake of those interested in undertaking a similar project, we would emphasize: the need for careful preliminary planning (to which we devoted an entire semester); involving participating institutions as fully as possible via financial contributions and public statements of support by administrators; involving participating faculty in the decision making and preparing them for future leadership; incorporating procedures for evaluating the project as it is in process; balancing formal presentations, for example on the large issues of background and theory that are necessary to locate the project and its importance within the larger context of higher education, with opportunities that begin early in the project for "hands-on" individual work.

The project directors confirmed their commitment to curriculum integration, particularly at the community college, and to the faculty seminar approach. A cadre of excellent, knowledgeable coordinators who are trained in feminist studies and in workshop facilitation is one of the cornerstones to a successful project. It also became clear to the directors that a more diverse group of participants--that is, more minorities--would have added to the group's own growth.

Student and faculty enthusiasm is clear evidence to the directors that there is a

real need to fund community college faculty projects that enable faculty to re-visit their disciplines in order to integrate material on gender, race, and class. Faculty repeatedly expressed both appreciation and frustration: appreciation for the opportunity for intensive study and frustration at the need to continue this work, to share their interest and knowledge with often resistant colleagues, and their concern that a fifteen hour teaching load per semester will "consume" them. Support for dissemination projects in the form of released time, therefore, is necessary to keep the momentum going and, more important, to meet the needs of the faculty and their students.

There is another compelling, and challenging, need for external funding: to extend this work to the integration of scholarship on women and minorities into technical and vocational courses. The students who enroll in certificate programs, short-courses or semester-length technical courses do not experience revised courses and courses that reflect the experiences of women and minorities. Although faculty from these fields have complained, or simply stated, that they feel "left out," they are seldom the beneficiaries of curriculum revision projects. We see the need for projects that are targeted to these faculty.